Vol. IX, No. 35 HUMAN EVENTS August 27, 1952

THE KEEP AMERICA SOLVENT COMMITTEE

By FREDERIC C. NELSON

REPUBLICANS may well be appalled to read in the *Washington Post* and similar Jacobin journals that Adlai Stevenson's nomination by the Democrats means that the campaign will be on a "high level".

The Republicans can't win with a high level campaign. They will have to throw everything but the water bucket at the Democrats, including "personalities", McCarthyism and the Stars and Stripes Forever, not to mention plenty of *Amerasia,* the fraudulent "truce talks" in Korea and the padding of "foreign aid" to include such bargains as the employment of American professors to instruct visiting European delegations in labor relations, presumably à la Phil Murray. The GOP will have to give Acheson the business and outline in detail how American official stupidity, plus some high-level treason, sold the pass in Europe and Asia.

Republican candidates can't afford to make the mistake of assuming that the American people want what Walter Lippmann wants, namely a campaign without issues, to be followed by the induction into office of a new set of men in Brooks Suits, equipped with Truman-Acheson policies.

Such a result would suit some of the GOP's more dubious well-wishers down to the ground. Indeed, Mr. Lippmann offers as a reason why reluctant "independents" should vote for Eisenhower the possibility that a defeat for Eisenhower would deliver the Republican Party "into the hands of its most irreconcilable and ruthless factions". Lippmann refers, of course, to Republicans who want to scotch the Fair Deal — in short, Republicans who think the issue between statism and liberty ought to be settled.

It is possible that General Eisenhower may yet dispel some prevailing doubts as to his hostility to the Fair Deal, the Welfare State and uncritical "internationalism" and stand forth as the Kansas-type conservative, slightly to the right of William Allen White. Maybe he is. However, nothing could hearten the conservative majority so much right now as one of those "Dropping the Pilot" scenes, with Governor Dewey quietly slipping over the side into the fog, while Eisenhower on the bridge orders, "Full steam ahead and damn the torpedoes."

However, if the American conservative majority is condemned to a renewal of the

Copyright 1952 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.
Published weekly at 900 Nineteenth Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

delaying action which for the past twenty years it has been forced to carry on amidst the encircling collectivist gloom, the arena will necessarily be Capitol Hill. Breastworks will have to be thrown up in the halls of Congress to protect the people against the onslaughts of the Giveaway Guards and the Point Four Hussars and the Rough Riders in the professorial pink coats who give us socialism while affecting to defend us from it. It is in Congress that the more frenzied forces of the New and Fair Deals have been at least temporarily delayed and thrown off balance. Without the hard core of the conservative resistance movement, from Glass and Joe Martin to Byrd and Taft, stalwarts who stood up to a barrage of dead cats and tomatoes for two decades, we should probably by this time be living under something pretty close to totalitarian rule.

HOW TO PRODUCE this hard core of resistance — and keep it nourished — out of our present confused and scattered whims and desires, and in spite of the artful seductions of 3500 Fair Deal "public relations" experts, is the problem. Nevertheless there are models from the past. Perhaps the perfect example is the Anti-Saloon League, an organization which pulled off the amazing coup of bringing prohibition to a nation of whisky drinkers.

The Anti-Saloon League achieved its success because it never split its openers, but stuck to one simple objective, namely the harassment and curbing of the liquor traffic and eventually the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution prohibiting the sale and manufacture of liquor. The League's lobbyists and propagandists asked only one thing of a candidate for Congress, or a member of that body seeking re-election, namely that he vote dry. The aspirant could have two heads, be a member of the Lucy Stone League and advocate suttee on a nation-wide basis. He could even be an alcoholic provided he remained sober long enough to vote dry.

As William M. Burke, superintendent of the Ohio branch of the League, once put it, "It is better to have a drunkard who will vote right than a saint who will vote wrong." The questionnaire which the League sent to candidates was simple and direct. It asked questions like these: "Do you believe in prohibition as a public policy? Do you favor legalization of light wines and beer? If elected will you pledge your personal and official efforts in support of enforcement of the prohibition law?"

Furthermore, the punishment of those who defied the League or backslid from its support was swift and terrible. It did the offender no good to point to his record on fiscal policy, national defense, protection of American industry or legislation in behalf of women in sweatshops. If he had voted wet, out he went into the darkness. Senator James M. Wadsworth of New York, surely a useful public official if there ever was one, defied

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the "moral forces of America" and voted against the Eighteenth Amendment as well as against prohibition enforcement legislation in 1925 and 1926. Although the League had no remote chance of electing a Senator any drier than Wadsworth, it could punish him by entering a third candidate against him. The result was the election of Robert F. Wagner who, besides being as wet as Wadsworth, was probably more obnoxious to Methodists and Baptists on other grounds. But the Anti-Saloon League got its man.

THE MORAL of all this now is that the way to obtain good legislation or block bad legislation is to concentrate on the individual candidate for Congress, pinpointing the bombardment to a definite and limited purpose. Whether the object be government economy, lower taxes, an end to indiscriminate Federal aid, further probing of the Communist penetration of the bureaucracy, or support for Chiang Kai-shek, the message of the Anti-Saloon League is: Stick to your last! "The League should take no official stand on other matters", declared Wayne B. Wheeler, the ASL general counsel, in summing up the lessons of a lifetime of lobbying.

At the moment the United States Senate's hard core of resistance to socialism and unlimited foreign spending is fairly impressive. Some of its constituent parts are knuckleheaded on other matters, but in a fight like this you have to take the cash and let the credit go. Among the Old Reliables in the Senate are Bricker, Taft, Jenner, Malone, Watkins, McCarran, Byrd, Welker, Case, Martin, Butler (Md.), Butler (Nebr.), Dirksen, Capehart, Cain, Ferguson, Eastland, George, Hickenlooper, Holland, Knowland, Kem, McCarthy, Maybank, Millikin, Russell, Stennis and Williams. They may disagree on the union shop, "discrimination", the Tidelands, the way to make a julep and the propriety of speaking sharply to Owen Lattimore. But they don't believe in socialism or in handing over what assets America has left to her competitors.

With a Fair Deal or McLiberal administration in control of the Executive, even this impressive array of guards and tackles would remain a defensive team. Some of them may be seen no more after November. Others may despair. If the American people, in election after election, are unwilling or unable to take the offensive and put a genuine conservative in the White House, the best defensive team will tire. "Back of all such endeavor", explained the Anti-Saloon League in one of its annual reports, "there must be a nation-wide movement of public opinion, voicing itself in a way that will be heard by every Congressman."

What is the formula for organizing and making effective a "movement of public opinion"? The results of the Congressional elections of 1946 and 1950 suggest that it is easier to mobilize conservative opinion in "off years" than in a presidential year, par-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ticularly when the national candidates act more like radio hams than like men of principle appealing to their fellow citizens for support. Presidential elections too often turn into what the reporters have come to call "beauty contests", in the course of which the people tend to forget that the basis of politics is who gets what, as CIO-PAC so convincingly put it, and not the relative charm of the contending candidates.

It is hardly surprising that in this quadrennial rat race, greater sanity and realism prevail at the Senatorial and House levels. The candidate for the White House may flatter the voter's vanity, like a successfully picked Derby winner. But it's the member of Congress who votes the farm subsidy — or shuts it off. In recent elections, candidates for Congress have tended to run ahead of the presidential candidate. Who rides on whose coattails?

What it comes down to is that if Mr. Lippmann's "irreconcilable and ruthless factions" [i.e., conservative Americans who want to see spending cut, taxes cut, Communism rooted out of the Government and effectively "contained" abroad without militarizing us at home] are to be permanently barred from the White House, then it's time to see to it that they are maintained in Congress and their tribe increased.

USING THE ANTI-SALOON LEAGUE formula, somebody might organize a Keep America Solvent Committee, whose single purpose would be to frustrate the spenders and the more starry-eyed internationalists through Congressional action. The Committee might pose to every candidate for Congress, whether sitting or virginal, some such questionnaire as this:

1. Will you support legislation making it possible to examine Federal appropriations in detail, so that every demand for money, especially for the fuzzier projects of the Mutual Security Agency, will be scrutinized for its relevancy to its supposed purpose?

2. Will you vote for the submission of an amendment to the Constitution making it impossible for international bodies to legislate on American domestic affairs through treaties?

3. Will you urge that a committee of Congress similar to the McCarran committee continue to investigate Communist infiltration of the Federal bureaucracy, past and present?

Perhaps three are too many questions for the purpose. However many there are, they should stick to the Wayne B. Wheeler formula of "no official stand on other matters". The object should be the creation and sustenance of a tough phalanx which will fight the people's battles, no matter what. If that can be done, the United States may survive in recognizable form until Walter Lippmann's "irreconcilable and ruthless factions" [you know: taxpayers, businessmen, parents of soldiers in Korea, anti-Fair Dealers] can mobilize their real strength.

Frederic C. Nelson is Associate Editor of the *Saturday Evening Post.*

ADDITIONAL COPIES: One—$.20; six—1.00; ten—1.50; fifty—5.50; one hundred—10.00. Quotations for larger quantities on request.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HUMAN EVENTS

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor* FRANK CHODOROV, *Associate Editor*

Volume IX, No. 35 Wednesday, August 27, 1952 Washington, D. C.

'52 LIBRARY

The Political Pot: "The stuffing is coming out of it" is a frequent comment around the Capital this week; the "it" means the Eisenhower campaign. During the past 48 hours, wire services and the trained seals of journalism finally recognized (what HUMAN EVENTS warned of as early as last spring) the weakness of Ike the Candidate.

On Sunday, Colonel McCormick bolted the GOP and urged a new party. The next day the Scripps-Howard chain took Ike to task, in a sharp editorial, for the weakness of his campaign. About the same time, the Knight newspapers (Chicago, Akron, Miami and Detroit) — like Scripps, pre-nomination backers of Ike — similarly sounded a negative note. And the wringing of hands by prominent columnists, early backers of Ike, has become a familiar spectacle in the press.

The McCormick bolt was derided by some of the Colonel's press rivals. It was not regarded as so funny by GOP politicos. The *Chicago Tribune* blankets Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin, a large part of Michigan and parts of Iowa and Minnesota. It exerts no little political influence in those parts. It is remarked today here that this bolt may work considerable damage to Ike's chances of winning the 93 electoral votes of the above-mentioned states.

Eisenhower Strategy: Ike's endorsement — or quasi-endorsement — of GOP congressional candidates who detest his foreign policies has set the public off on the wrong scent. It has been explained *ad taedium* in most of the press that Ike and his advisors have discovered that they must have these GOP "sons of the wild jackass" re-elected so that Ike can, if elected, enjoy congressional support.

Actually, the story is quite different. The truth is that Ike is "endorsing" these so-called "Old Guard" senators and representatives in the hope that he can ride on their coattails to victory, and get the electoral votes of their states.

Here is the story of the evolution of this policy, little understood by the public:

Right after his nomination, Ike's advisors deliberately laid down a strategy of jettisoning the congressional candidates. It was assumed that Ike had such overwhelming mass popularity that he would be swept in on a flood of electoral votes from all over. And when elected, what of Congress? He could command support of GOP and conservative Democratic members (even though the GOP could not organize Congress) to pass his domestic measures; and the support of internationalist Democrats plus the fringe of GOP "liberals" to put over his foreign policies. But this day dream soon began to fade, as it was realized that Ike did not have "mass magic", that he would have to "run scared".

At this point, his advisors recalled that in 1948, it was the GOP congressional candidates who helped Dewey rather than vice versa. The cold statistics are that 93 GOP House victors in that year ran ahead of Dewey and 63 ran behind; that of the 22 Senate seats outside the South, Republicans won nine, with Dewey trailing eight of the nine successful candidates on a plurality basis, and leading only one, this being in New Jersey. In the old days, it was normal for State and local candidates to run behind the national ticket. But since the rise of "me-tooism", the picture has been in reverse.

More statistics on the instructive campaign of '48. In the crucial Middle West, out of 73 Republicans elected to the House, a total of 47 ran ahead of Dewey. In six states — Iowa, Nebraska, Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota and Wisconsin — every winning Republican ran ahead of the Presidential candidate. In Indiana, 3 ran ahead of Dewey, 1 behind him. All these figures bear out Mr.

Copyright 1952 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.
Published weekly at 900 Nineteenth Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Nelson's statement in this week's HUMAN EVENTS article that "in recent elections, candidates for Congress have tended to run ahead of the Presidential candidate".

Friends of Adlai: With no partisan motive at all, but simply from the natural desire to remove brooding apprehensions, not a few in this nation's capital would very much like to know more about the past of the Democratic candidate for President.

They have in mind, cannot get out of mind, Stevenson's explanation about his relations with the traitor Hiss; especially Adlai's interview on the TV show "Meet the Press" last spring. It may not have been Stevenson's fault; it may have been due to the fact that time was called and the interview cut short — but many who saw that show and who have read the transcript are definitely not impressed with Stevenson's labored attempt to explain away this phase of his life.

That's one matter. Another has engaged attention. On August 7, the Washington *Times-Herald* published an interview with a highly respected retired naval officer, Rear Admiral Adolphus Staton, who served in the Navy Department in the early war years with Stevenson. The Admiral says that Stevenson helped block a congressional effort to keep Communist radio operators off U.S. merchant ships at that time. Roosevelt rejected the advice of admirals who wished to remove such subversives from their jobs.

When a House Committee sought to look into the business and called Staton for testimony, "Adlai Stevenson (says Admiral Staton) telephoned me that there were White House orders that I should not testify". Now, Stevenson may not have been a willing tool of F.D.R. in this affair, or he may have. Anyway, a number of people here would like the matter ventilated further. It is understood that evidence additional to that given by Staton to the Washington paper has got into congressional hands.

Also, there has come to light a few lines in the hearings of the McCarran Internal Security Subcommittee which makes those who read them puzzled. In those same early war years when Stevenson was under Secretary Knox, the Institute of Pacific Relations sought to organize a conference. (The McCarran Committee says that the IPR was controlled by members of a small core of officials and staff members who "were either Communist or pro-Communist".) In 1942, the IPR wrote a letter about their efforts to organize a conference in which it said that Alger Hiss had suggested Adlai Stevenson be invited to attend. (McCarran Committee Hearings, Part 2, p. 446.) There is no indication why Hiss wanted Stevenson, nor even if Stevenson knew anything about it. It may mean little, or it may mean much. But to those who are concerned about the past of a man who may become President, the episode needs elucidation.

Foreign Fronts: Best official (but not State Department) opinion is that General Naguib's seizure of power in Egypt has turned out to be a severe set-back to Soviet hopes in the Middle East. Moscow's infiltration and mob agitation in that land had gone far before Naguib took up arms and raised Kremlin hopes that Egypt would disintegrate. But Naguib after his revolt immediately set to work to purge Red elements in Egypt, with no little success.

——Word from Europe is that NATO is in process of falling to pieces despite the optimistic attitude assumed by Acheson; and that the ruins will be glaringly visible by November. No matter who becomes President, he will face a terrific task abroad.

——The foreign front of Eisenhower may be sensationally disclosed by Democrats before long. It is rumored here that Fair Deal sources possess documentary evidence of a pre-convention commitment made by Ike to his backers, Governor Dewey and banker Aldrich. Ike in these documents pledged himself to follow the foreign policy of these two prominent internationalists.

Up She Goes: Last week the Bureau of Labor Statistics made it official, with decimal points: the cost of living is going up. For the month ending July 15, its barometer of prices showed an increase of 1.2 per cent over the preceding month; it was 2.9 per cent higher than the reading of a year ago; 12.1 per

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cent up from June, 1950, when Korea began; 190.8 per cent — nearly double — of the 1935-1939 average, which is the base of the Bureau's computations.

This offers official confirmation of what we suspected all along. The BLS, however, unlike the weather bureau, refuses to prognosticate. We must therefore figure out for ourselves what the future will bring in the way of high prices.

The published figures will soon support a demand for a general increase in wages, which will be granted after some haggling, and will then be added to the price of goods; this will be recorded by the BLS in a new official index, replete with decimals. The public reaction will not be pleasant to hear, and the business fraternity will put the blame on the unions, who will in turn point the finger of scorn at profits. The kindly government will declare a new "emergency", calling for wage-and-price controls with "teeth" — and with appropriations. Prices will continue to rise.

Prices rise because there is a short supply of, and a large demand for, goods. Prices have been ascending since the base period, 1935-39, because of the constantly increasing absorption of goods by the government, through taxation. At the same time, the government kept on creating an "effective demand" for goods by issuing more and more money, or (which is the same thing in effect) by issuing bonds against which checkbook money is created.

There seems to be no disposition on the part of government — no matter which party is put in charge of it — to curtail expenditures; which means that there is no prospect of a let-up in the sapping of the market. And, even if the printing of new money (the usual nostrum to make us "rich") is not resorted to, there are billions in "savings" bonds that will shortly be maturing and will be replaced in large measure by negotiable bonds, the kind that seminate checkbook money.

Prices can continue to rise. How high? Until money, in terms of goods, becomes worthless.

NATO: One of our rural correspondents complains that the only 3 cent stamps supplied to his local post office by Washington are those of the NATO (North Atlantic Treaty Organization) Memorial issue. Thus forced to publicize the international organization, he enters into the spirit of that topsy-turvy debating society by sticking the purple markers upside down on his envelopes.

Communist Sabotage: To read Administration columnists, one would conclude that — despite McCarthy's accusations — the existence of Communists in Government is a "witch-hunting myth". We have just received a letter from Mr. John Evans of the Argus Publishing Company in Chicago. He thanks us for our recent mention of his book, *Communist Trade Union Trickery Exposed*, by Karl Baarslag, and remarks that he is not sure that all copies of the book put in the mail have reached their destination. He says: "We have been having trouble with Communists in the Chicago Post Office and have evidence that much of our mail, especially bulk circular matter, has been lost or destroyed by the Post Office and never delivered. Argus Publishing Company is well known to the comrades and has been denounced in the *Daily Worker*. An informant employed here in the Old Post Office where our mail is handled states that there are at least 8 active Communists working at that station. One publisher, *Counterattack*, returned the empty envelope to us. It was securely sealed when it left here, but had been forcibly opened and the book removed."

Textbook Loyalty: A country is in good shape when the loyalty of the citizenry is taken for granted; when the government finds it necessary to put up safeguards against disloyalty, it is because disloyalty is rampant, and in that event one cannot say the country is in good shape. The news from Texas is, therefore, quite sobering. The State Board of Education has authorized the Commission of Education to request publishers of textbooks to vouch for the qualification of the authors under the State's non-subversive oath. That oath, a requisite for employment by the State, states that the signer is not and never has been a member of the Communist Party and for ten years has not been a member of listed subversive groups.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The oath is unimportant, except that its use is an evidence of widespread disloyalty. The Communists will sign it with alacrity, for their ideology stands higher in their estimation than their own honor. Furthermore, the oath does not affect those who, while violently rejecting Communism, advocate the collectivistic measures that must ultimately lead to Communism, like social security, socialized medicine and various schemes for centralizing power. Too many textbook writers are in the latter class. Most colleges in their economics courses use textbooks which give aid and comfort to centralization; yet their authors are, by their own admission, anti-Communist.

The action of the Texas Board of Education may have a good effect, in a way probably not contemplated by the authorities. It will put the publishers on their guard. These publishers are anxious to sell books, regardless of what's in them. Now they must, if they want to sell copies in Texas, take a more critical look at the texts. Perhaps that will induce them to read manuscripts that are definitely anti-statist as well as anti-Communist. Perhaps they will even publish books that take a dim view of collectivism. The writers of such textbooks now are without a market.

As we go to press we note that Governor Stevenson has paid his respects, before the American Legion convention today, to the "self-appointed thought police or ill-informed censors" who are making "indiscriminate attacks on our schools". These words could have been taken out of the literature of the NEA, the lobby that has for years been trying to nationalize our school system through subsidization.

Nuremberg: As a result of the Nuremberg code of "justice" which the U.S. created, our Chinese and North Korean Red enemies are in a position to try as war criminals American airmen who have been shot down on air raids, according to a dispatch in the *Chicago Tribune* (August 22) from London. This is the view of William Boyle, Earl of Cork and Orrery, former Admiral of the British fleet.

"Under long standing pre-Nuremberg laws of war", the Admiral said, "the airmen would have been considered prisoners and protected by laws guarding prisoners. However . . . now under the code drawn up for Nuremberg, the airmen could be tried for crimes against humanity — that is, for dropping bombs on civilians or 'confessed' germ warfare."

The British Admiral also remarked that military men in the pre-Nuremberg days could not be tried for their actions while carrying out orders. Now, as a result of the famous war crimes trials, military personnel can be held responsible, even though they were acting under orders from their superiors.

In the *Tribune* dispatch, Lord Hankey was reported to have entered the controversy and is quoted as charging that the Roosevelt and Truman administrations wanted the change from the traditional rules of war to the Nuremberg code of justice for a special reason: to protect the behavior of the Roosevelt crowd before Pearl Harbor. Lord Hankey explained that under traditional international law, the President and members of his Government were open to prosecution for the policy of lend-lease, the destroyer-for-bases exchange and other acts of assistance to Britain at a time when the U.S. was professedly neutral. "The idea behind the Nuremberg trials", Hankey said, "was to make these pre-war American measures legal by changing the rules so as to make 'war criminals' of politicians who waged 'aggressive warfare'."

In this discussion in England, so reported the *Tribune*, it was emphasized that the British and French governments opposed the change from traditional to Nuremberg rules of war, but yielded under U.S. pressure.

Lord Hankey, our readers may be reminded, is the author of a book *Politics, Trials and Errors*, published in 1950 by the Henry Regnery Company of Chicago, and reviewed in HUMAN EVENTS on May 17, 1950. It is an excellent critical analysis of the Nuremberg trial.

Entered as second class matter at the Post Office, Washington, D. C. Quotation up to a paragraph is permitted with credit to HUMAN EVENTS. For reproduction or more extensive quotation address requests to HUMAN EVENTS, 900 Nineteenth Street, N.W., Washington 6, D.C. Trial Subscription, three months for $3. Six months, $5.50. One year, $10. Two years, $18. First class mail, one year, $11.00; six months, $6.00. Domestic airmail (including APO and FPO) one year, $12.00; foreign (regular mail) one year, $11. Foreign airmail rates on request. Please remit in U.S.A. DOLLARS. Allow two weeks for new subscription or change of address to become effective.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED